IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS AUSTIN DIVISION

T.S., by and through his next friend,	§	
N.O.; and G.A.;	§	
individually and on behalf of all others	§	
similarly situated,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	CASE NO. 1:19-cv-809-RP
v.	§	
	§	
The Burke Foundation	§	
d/b/a Burke Center for Youth,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

JOINT MOTION TO AMEND SCHEDULING ORDER

Plaintiffs T.S. and G.A. and Defendant The Burke Foundation file this Joint Motion to Amend the Scheduling Order. In support of the Motion, the parties show the following:

- 1. The current Scheduling Order has a deadline of January 28, 2021 for the parties to complete discovery. (Doc. $30, \P 4$.)
- 2. As noted in the parties' Joint Discovery Plan and Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) Report (Doc. 9, \P 7), the nature of this case and of the putative class presents unique challenges necessitating flexibility with respect to scheduling matters. A trial date was not set during the initial pretrial conference to accommodate potential modifications to the scheduling order (Doc. 14, \P 9; Doc. 30, \P 6).
- 3. The parties presently need to expand the discovery period to allow sufficient time for them to confer and attempt to cooperatively resolve certain disputes regarding Defendant's discovery production prior to conducting depositions, a process that has been delayed due to Defendant's need to substitute its attorney who largely handles the day to day of the case.

- 4. On June 18, 2020, Plaintiffs served their first written discovery requests. Defendant—through its then attorney, Roy E. Mathews—provided its final responses on September 3, 2020, following two agreed extensions of its deadline. After reviewing said responses, Plaintiffs sent Defendant a letter outlining the extent to which Plaintiffs perceive the responses and production to be insufficient—largely linked to possible disputes between the parties regarding the scope of discovery related to potential class members.
- 5. In September, Mr. Mathews left Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP for a new career opportunity, and was replaced by Liz E. Drumm as counsel in this matter. Ms. Drumm reasonably required time to immerse herself in the matter prior to conferring with Plaintiffs' counsel. The parties have now begun the process of conferring amicably, but have not yet resolved the pending issues.
- 6. For these reasons, the parties are in agreement that additional time is necessary to complete discovery in this action.
- 7. The parties presently seek a 120-day extension of each pending deadline to address the above-described delays. Given the size and composition of the proposed class, the volume and sensitivity of potentially relevant records, and the unusual procedural posture of the case, the parties anticipate that subsequent modifications to the scheduling order may be needed.
- 8. This Motion is not made for the purpose of delay, but rather for the purposes of fairness and efficient use of resources, and the interest of justice will be served by granting this Motion.

Therefore, the parties jointly propose to the Court an Amended Scheduling Order extending the deadlines by 120 days and setting the following deadlines, which are also in the proposed order:

1. A report on alternative dispute resolution in compliance with Local Rule CV-88

shall be filed on or before February 26, 2021.

2. The parties shall file all motions to amend or supplement pleadings or to join

additional parties on or before December 30, 2020.

3. Plaintiffs shall designate testifying experts by March 12, 2021, and Defendants

shall designate testifying experts by March 26, 2021. All parties shall file all designations of

rebuttal experts and serve on all parties the material required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure

26(a)(2)(B) for such rebuttal experts, to the extent not already served, 15 days from the receipt of

the report of the opposing expert.

4. The parties shall complete all discovery on or before May 28, 2021.

5. All dispositive motions shall be filed on or before <u>June 29, 2021</u> and shall be limited

to 20 pages. Responses shall be filed and served on all other parties not later than 14 days after the

service of the motion and shall be limited to 20 pages. Any replies shall be filed and served on all

other parties not later than 7 days after the service of the response and shall be limited to 10 pages,

but the Court need not wait for the reply before ruling on the motion.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Anna Bocchini

Anna Bocchini

State Bar No. 24057410

1 1:::0 1:::0

abocchini@equaljusticecenter.org

Rebecca C. Eisenbrey

State Bar No. 24097646

reisenbrey@equaljusticecenter.org

EQUAL JUSTICE CENTER

314 E Highland Mall Blvd, Suite 401

Austin, TX 78752

(512) 474-0007 ext. 132

Ted Evans State Bar No. 24099351 tevans@disabilityrightstx.org DISABILITY RIGHTS TEXAS 6800 Park Ten Boulevard, Suite 208N San Antonio, Texas 78213 (832) 681-8224

Peter Hofer State Bar No. 09777275 phofer@drtx.org DISABILITY RIGHTS TEXAS 2222 West Braker Lane Austin, Texas 78758 (512) 454-4816

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

By: /s/Robert A. Bragalone
Robert A. Bragalone
State Bar No. 02855850
GORDON REES SCULLY
MANSUKHANI, LLP.
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 4100W
Dallas, TX 75201
(214) 231-4714 (telephone)
(214) 461-4053 (facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 6, 2020, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to all attorneys of record.

/s/Anna Bocchini